

Appln No. 10/803,380  
Amdt date July 28, 2006  
Reply to Office action of June 1, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested.

Claims 1 - 8 are now in the application. Claim 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 have been amended. Claims 9 - 15 have been withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 as to informalities of the terms "a first electrode" and "a second electrode". The Applicant has amended Claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner, to call for (underlining added for emphasis) ... a plurality of second electrodes provided in the row direction on the first substrate, at least one of said plurality of second electrodes being formed between and common to two adjacent first electrodes, at least one of said plurality of first electrodes being formed between and common to two adjacent second electrodes, ... . Claims 2, 5, 6 and 7 have been similarly amended to conform to Claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2 and 4 - 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Namiki. The Examiner has also rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hirose.

The Applicant's amended Claim 1 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) ... at least one of said plurality of second electrodes being formed between and common to two adjacent first electrodes, at least one of said plurality of first electrodes being formed between and common to two adjacent second electrodes, ...

As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Namiki under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Namiki, while providing for pairs of electrodes to generate surface discharge in plasma display panel cells, each X - Y electrode pair is associated with a particular row of cells, as can be seen in FIG. 1. For example, there is no Y electrode common to two adjacent X electrodes. On the other hand, as can be seen in FIG. 3A of the present application, an electrode 10 is formed between and is common to adjacent electrodes 20, the commonality being further seen by protrusion electrodes 11a, 11b protruding from common electrode 10 and providing gaps 51, 52

Appln No. 10/803,380  
Amdt date July 28, 2006  
Reply to Office action of June 1, 2006

with protrusions 21a, 21b of the adjacent electrodes 20. Similarly, an electrode 20 is formed between and is common to adjacent electrodes 10, the commonality between further seen by protrusion electrodes 21a, 21b protruding from common electrode 20 and providing gaps 51, 52 with protrusions 11a, 11b of the adjacent electrodes 10.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Namiki under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 2 - 8 are dependent on Claim 1. As such, these claims are believed allowable based upon Claim 1.

Therefore, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. As such, allowance of the above-referenced Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP



By

Richard J. Paciulan  
Reg. No. 28,248  
626/795-9900

RJP/cah

CAH PAS686956.1-\*07/28/06 7:59 AM